### INDEX

Of

# WITNESSES

Prosecution's "itnesses	Page
Ballantine, Joseph W. (resumed)	11145
Cross by Mr.S. OKAHOTO (continued)	11145
James O. Richardson, Admiral, USN (Ret)	11166
Direct by Captain Robinson	11166
Cross by Mr. Brannon	11238

## INDEX

Of

### EXHIBITS

Doc. No.	Pros.	Def. No.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
6257	1249		Affidavit of James O. Richardson, Admiral, USN (Ret)	11173	11238
6250	1250		Memorandum of Conversations between the American and Japanese Delegations, 29 October, 1934, at Claridg		11178
6251	1251		Book entitled "The Departme of State Conference Serie No. 24, the London Naval Conference 1935"		

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

	Pros.	1101	In Evidence
52 <b>51-</b> .	A 1251 <b>-</b> A	Excerpt from above book entitled "The Department of State Conference Series No. 24, the London Naval Conference 1935"	11180
17	1.252	Combined Fleet Top Secret Operation Orders No. 1, 2, and 7	11193
6254 <b>-</b> A	1253-A	Aerial Reconnaissance Photo- graphs of Wotje Island taken by U. S. Navy Photographic Intolligence Unit	1.1200
6254 <b>-</b> B	1253-B	Ditto	11200
6254 <b>-</b> C	1253-C	Japanese Blueprint Map of Wotje Island dated 10 Nove ber 1940, captured by American Forces landing at Kwajalein in February 1944	11200
6255	1254	Book entitled "Japanese Messages Concerning Military Installations, Ship Movements, etc." 11204	
5255 <b>-</b> A	1254-A	Excerpt therefrom	11205
6258	1255	Sketch Map of Pearl Harbour after the Attack of 7 December 1941 (JICPOA D-1071)	11206

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Doc.	Pros.	Description	For Ident.	In Evid nce
6255 <b>-</b> C	1256	Message from Tokyo (TOGO) to Honolulu (RIYOJI) dated 15 November 1941		11209
6255 <b>-</b> D	1257	Message from Honolulu (KITA) to Tokyo dated 18 November 1941		11210
6255 <b>-</b> E	1258	Message from Tokyo (TOGO) to Honoluludated 2 December 1941		11211
6256 <b>-</b> A	1259	Affidavit of Otto Kuehn dated 1 January 1942		11213
6256 <b>-</b> B	1260	Affidavit of Otto Kuehn dated 3 January 1942 (1941)		11213
6255 <b>-</b> F	1261	Meesage from Honolulu (KITA) to Tokyo dated 3 December 1941		11216
6255 <b>-</b> G	1262	Message from Honolulu to Tokyo dated 5 December 1941		11220
6255 <b>-</b> Н	1263	Message dated 6 December 1941 from Honolulu to Tokyo (#253)		11221
6255 <b>-</b> I	1264	Message from Honolulu to Tokyo dated 6 December 1941 (#254)		11224
1627	1265	"Allied Translator and Interpreter Section, Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers Research Report No. 132 dated 1 December 1945, the Pearl Harbour Operation"	rt	11227

1 Monday, 25 November, 1946 2 3 4 INTERN/TION/L MILIT/RY TRIBUN/L FOR THE F/R EAST 5 Court House of the Tribunel
Wer Ministry Building
Tokyo, Jepen 6 7 8 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 9 rt 0930. 10 11 Appearances: 12 For the Tribunel, seme as before with the 13 exception of the HONOR/BLE R. B. P/L, Member from 14. India, not sitting. 15 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 16 For the Defense Section, same re before. 17 The Lecused: 18 All present except OKAWA, Shumei, who is 19 20 represented by his counsel. 21 22 (English to Japanese and Japanese 23 to English interpretation was made by the 24 Language Section, IMTFE.) 25

Wolf & Duda

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE FRESIDENT: Major Moore.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore): Mr. President, if the Tribunal please, I beg leave to present some language corrections. Copies of what I am about to read are presented for the convenience of the Tribunal.

Exhibit 1117, record page 10,166, line 26, the sentence beginning "The Emperor" should read "As stated by the Vice Lord Chamberlain, I received the Imperial order to give a reply after gathering your Excellency's opinion."

Line 17, delete from "saying that" to "Army and" and substitute "as a person good for the military and capable of exercising general control over all lines of..."

Line 25, after "GHQ" transpose "in the palace."

THE PRESIDENT: Insert "in the palace" in this document.

LANGUAGE ARTITER (Major Moore): I regret, sir, that that word should be transposed, since the words are taken from the following sentence and carried over into the sentence before. The punctuation mark was in error.

After "YOMAI said" should read "no other person than Prince KONOYE would do."

14.

Page 10,168, line 12, after "Cabinet" insert 1 the sentence "After his audience, I met and tolked with 2 him." 3 Exhibit 1146, record page 10,242, line 2, after 4 "obroad" should read "it is very difficult to predict the outcome of wor with the U.S.A. So we had better ... " 6 and so forth. Line 7, paragraph 4, should red "Rather it 8 should be made clear that the termination of the China 9 Incident is the first consideration." 10 Line 12, paragraph 6, should read "The people 11 should be made to understand the necessity for ten 12 13 or ... " and so forth. Line 13, insert "and" between "nation" and "to 14 15 establish." 16 Exhibit 1147, record page 10,247, line 14, delete from "bring about" to line 18 "for a" and 17 18 substitute "do it thoroughly. To turn to ... " Line 22, after "porley" insert "and hoped to con-19 20 inue to act with this idea." 21 Page 10,248, line 2, delete from "Our demands" 22 to end of sentence and substitute "In Tapanese American relations: 24 "l. e should not chan a our policy of station-25 ing troops in China or the other policies connected with

11. "2. We should not entertain enything that might 2 offset the result of the China Incident. 3 "With those points in view, it should be found 1 out wiether negotiations can be successful within the 5 time set by the Digh Command. When this has been ascer-6 trined the matter should be settled through diplomacy. 7 Such being the case, all operations preparations be discontinued. The Foreign Winister should study the 9 10 above to find out whether it is possible or not." 11 Exhibit 1150, record page 10,276, line 1, 12 "YAKATA" should rond "TATE (YAKATA)." 15 Line 7, delete "The War Minister did not mention 14 his name" and substitute "it may not be well to desig-15 nate the next Premier." 16 Line 10, substitute "not depart from" for 17 "follow." 18 Line 20, substitute "s prudent" for "an inde-19 pendent." 20 Line 23, ofter "on this point" insert "then 21 added that the matter needs to be studied carafully." Page 10,277, line 6, after "situation" insert 23 "At 2:00 p.m. YAMAZAKI, Chief of the Herropolitan Policy 24 Board came and spoke to me on current political affairs." Line 15, delete "that I did not" and substitute

22

"what I stated to President SUZUKI this morning. As I had yet to..."

Line 18, delete from "and I had" to and of santence.

Page 10,278, line 5, after "said that" delete to end of sentence and substitute "when he made a report to the Emperor on the proposed plan. His Vajesty said that if the Army and the Navy agreed upon the peace-ful policy and it is the outcome of necessity to have the Prince's Cabinet, then there was no alternative but to approve the plan."

Line 23, substitute "Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal" for "Home Minister."

Line 24, delete from "I made" to end of sentence and substitute "I was received in audience by the Emperor; His Maiesty gave me his opinion on the proposed premiership of Prince HIGASTIKUNI reported to him by the Premier."

Exhibit 1151, record page 10,282, line 12, paragraph 2, should red "According to what developed since last night, the difficulties have not been solved and a member of the Imperial family should never be asked to overcome these obstacles."

Page 10,283, line 4, after "SUZUKI" insert "I pointed out that the decisions made at the Imparial

Conforunce on September 6 were rather careless and..."

Line 6, delete from "a unified policy" to "factors" and substitute "I also stressed the necessity of true unity between the Army and the Navy. I stressed the fact that this was the least our country is asking for..." and so forth.

Exhibit 1154, record page 10,291, line 17, delete "Viscount."

Line 18, delete "Admiral" and "General." Line 19, delete "General" and "Admiral."

Line 21, delete from "Nr. WAKATSUKI" to end
of sentence and substitute "Except for the recommendation of General UGAKI by Baron WAKATSUKI and the suggestion of a Cabinet under a member of the Imperial
family by General MAYASHI, no one had a definite opinion."

Page 10,292, line 2, after presence insert "September 6."

Line 6, substitute "active duty" for "military service."

Line 15, delete sentence beginning "This was followed..." and substitute "Subsequently, he summoned Navy Minister OIKAWA and talked with him regarding cooperation between the Army and Navy."

Line 20, "His Mojesty has tolked to you in

1-1

regard to cooperation between the Army and Mavy."

Line 21, substitute "you" for "we."

Exhibit 1181, record page 10,389, line 20, paragraph 1, should read "Remain as at present without advancing beyond its preliminary stage."

Paragraph 2, "Partiel acceptance of our demands."

Paragraph a, "Acceptance of a very small

portion of our demands."

Page 10,390, line 4, delete paregraph and substitute:

"Thus several phases of the situation must be foreseen and it would oppour that there is left enough ground for controversy with regard to our rushing into the war headleng on the mare automatic grounds that the last day of the month of November has passed. If we did so it is forced that it might exercise an undesirable influence on the unification of public opinion in the future. Accordingly, I advised his Pajesty, when the Premier solicits his Majesty's final decision, if circumstances require, the Premier should be ordered to hold the council in the Importal presence with the participation therein of all the senior statesmen.

Exhibit 1190, record name 10,430, line 1, delate from "as we nee" to and of a ntance and substitute "Once the final decision is made this time it

would truly be the last and irretrievably final one. 1 Thus if there should be any doubt or any better idea 2 to surmount the difficulties in your Hajesty's mind, 3 I pray that your Majasty be pleased to elucidate the 5 same without the least reserve and take appropriate 6 steps which your Priesty might not repent of ofterwords. 7 "I therefore prov that your Majesty command the 8 Promier without reserve." 9 Exhibit 1210, r cord page 10,523, line 17, 10 substitute "against" for "between Japan and ... " 11 Line 10, "fter "visited ne" rend "to discuss 12 the Imperial Reservot to Declare War." 13 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Major. 14 LANGUAGY ARBITUR (Major Moore): Trat is all. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 2-1 25

JOSEPH W. BALLANTIME, called as a witness on behalf of the presecution, resumed the stand and testified as follows:

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

THE PRESIDENT: I'r. OKATOTO.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: I am OKAMOTO, Shoichi. I shall continue my cross-examination from where I left off on Friday.

#### May I have the last reply rend?

(Whereupon, the answer of the witness was read by the official court reporter from the transcript of the record of 22 November 1946 as follows:

"A "We had received information from these unofficial Japanese representatives; we had had constant -- had representations made to us about these liberal forces ready to come forth if we'd only be patient; and many other representations of that character.")

### BY MR. S. OKAMOTO (Continuing):

O My last question to vou on Friday afternoon concerned the words in your affidavit which spoke of the difficult internal situation faced by the Japanese Government. What did the State Department consider this difficult internal situation to be?

THE PRESIDENT: Wall, that has been answered. 1 really. 2 MR. S. OKAMOTO: Did the witness answer to a 3 question put by some other counsel? I am asking you, 4 Mr. Prosident. 5 6 THE PRESIDENT: You have already heard the witness' enswer. MR. S. OKAMOTO: I bog your perdon, sir. Did 8 9 he inswer to this question -- did another counsel put 10 the same cuestion to him? THE PRESIDENT: No. He said, in effect, the 11 12 internal difficulties that he heard about were from 13 representations about liberal forces that would be 114 ready to come forth if the Americans would only be 15 petiont. 16 To shorten the proceedings I will ask you to 17 repeat what you have said in another form, if necessary. 18 Did you hear anything about internal 19 difficulties, apart from some liberal movement in Japan? 20 THE TIMESS: What I was referring to entirely 21 was a conflict between so-called forces that wanted to 22 pursue existing policy and moderate forces in Japan. 23 THE PRESIDENT: The only differences you heard 24

about were political differences?

THE VITHESS: That is correct.

Q Tould such things as I am going to say also come within the scope of what you referred to as the difficult internal situation; that is to say, I would like to question you on what follows in your affidavit concerning public opinion in Japan; that is to say, was not such an opinion current in Japanese circles as this: At the time Japan was faced by a -- because of the personness of her territory, she was faced with over-population so that she had to expand either by emigration or by trade expansion. In spite of this necessity, the United States excluded Japanese immigrants. And while we leave aside the question of bloc conomics in other parts of the world for a moment, is it not rather unfair only to insist on an open-door policy in China?

THE PRESIDENT: You need not answer that question. That invites you to express an opinion on a long statement of alleged fact by the counsel.

The witness is not here to give opinions of that kind. We refuse to hear his opinions. We have already decided to do so.

IR. S. OKAMOTO: I'r. President, I am sorry to infringe upon the Court's time, but I was not stating my opinion. I was stating the facts regarding Japanese public opinion from various documents of the time and

2

3 4

6

7

9

S

10

11

1,3

14

16

17 18

19 20

21

23

25

from my own recollection in the shortest possible form.

the question that you put to him. I have repeatedly said that we are not accepting this witness' opinions, whether they be for Japan or against Japan, or against Japan, or against Japan, or against

President's order regarding opinions. That I wish to ask the mitners is what view the State Department took of this trand in Japanese public ominion, of the facts concerning the State Department's views.

THE PRESIDENT: You are assuming facts there.
You may ask him what influenced the Department in the course of the negotiations.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: I shall do so, sir.

Q Mr. Witness, what was the trend of Japanese opinion which influenced the State Department in the course of its negotiations and which was a basis for the State Department in forming its opinion as these negotiations went along?

THE PRESIDENT: Have you told us all you know about that? If so, you need not repeat what you have said already.

THE WITHES: I might add one brief comment.
We falt that we had taken care of legitimate feelings

of the Japanese press by having at mind at all times offering Japan a peaceful alternative.

THE PRESIDENT: Was that communicated to the Japanese negotiators?

THE WITNESS: That was communicated.

THE PRESIDENT: We want to know what was said and done by the State Dapartment in the course of the negotiations to the extent that you have not already told us.

Yes, Mr. OKAMOTO; have you any further questions?

Q Was the original proposals for a Japanese-American acreement not welcomed by high officials of the State Department because it was first presented by Japanese acting in an unofficial capacity as well as American friends of Japan who were also acting in an unofficial capacity?

THE PRESIDENT: Have you told us all you know about that?

THE WITTESS: I think I have told all I know about that.

THE PRESIDENT: You need not add to it.

Q On page 10, paragraph 2, of your affidavit, you state that America made a proposal to the Japanese for the neutralization of Indo-China -- French Indo-China.

.

.

Did the State Department realize at the time that

French Indo-China was pro-American and that the
neutralization of Indo-China would not help Japan to
gain anything at all -- pro-British and pro-American
neutralization -- was pro-British and pro-American?

The PRESIDENT: That also assumes that they
were.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: I shall correct myself.

Q Would not the neutralization of Indo-China
have made it difficult for Japan to import goods?

THE PRESIDENT: He is not asked to express
any opinion.

Q Did the State Department think so?

THE PRESIDENT: What did they communicate to
the Japanese about that?

A The President of the United States spoke at great length with the Japanese imbassador, pointing out especially that by that proposal the Japanese would get all that they wanted in the way of materials which they required.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: I shall try to prove this point later.

Q On the day before the freezing act, President Rootevalt in a speech at Washington before the Civilian Volunteer Committee of the Office of Civilian Defense,

Japan to import oil bitherto was in order to prevent
Japan from moving into French Indo-China -- correction:
into the Dutch East Indies. If America had prohibited
the export of oil a year earlier we would have been
engaged in war from that time. Do you remember this
statement?

A I remember what the President said on that

A I remember what the President said on that occasion. But I can't speculate as to whether we would or would not have been in war. That I don't know.

Goldberg & spratt

THE PRESIDENT: That statement about avoiding war is purely a gratuitous one by counsel. It is really an attempt to give evidence; but no amount of correction seems to prevent Japanese counsel and, perhaps, other counsel from making those statements. Counsel are confined to asking questions. They must not make statements.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: I was merely quoting from President Roosevelt's words, and concerning whether America would or would not have gone to war a year earlier. I was merely quoting President Roosevelt's exact words.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you were badly interpreted then. I certainly got the impression and everybody else, the witness included, that you were not doing so.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: I shall put this question in a new form.

Do you remember that on July 23, 1941,
President Roosevelt made a speech as follows before
the Civilian Volunteer Committee of the Office of
Civilian Defense --

THE PRESIDENT: "ell, now, you have heard what the speech was and you have already told us you did not remember.

MR. S. OMAMOTO: I shall not continue this line further.

Q I call your attention to paragraph 3 of page 10 of your affidavit. You state that the Japanese move into southern Indo-China was an aggravated overt act. Skipping a few lines, you state that it was essential that the United States make a definite and clear move in self-defense.

THE PRESIDENT: They are opinions which we have disregarded. You need not cross-examine upon them.

Q I wish to ask you whether this was the opinion of the State Department? Will you reconsider this matter? Is it not true that you have stated here the opinion of the State Department and not your own?

THE PRESIDENT: We will allow you to answer that. He apparently wants that. I do not know how it will help him. I think it will injure him if it is answered a certain way.

A That was the opinion of the State Department in which I fully concurred.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we will ignore your concurrence, Mr. Ballantine.

I think you had better station a page at

that lectern. The red light means nothing.

THE MONITOR: May I have the whole thing repeated, please?

("Thereupon, the last question was read by the Japanese court reporter and interpreted as follows:)

Q boes this mean that the United States decided on a war against Japan then? I wish to get the fact regardless of whether it is to our advantage or to our disadvantage. It is the unanimous opinion of the Japanese counsel that they wish to get the facts.

THE PRESIDENT: The fact you want to get

THE PRESIDENT: The fact you want to get at now would be extremely favorable to you if you could get it.

Do you know what was the intention of the State Department at that time?

THE WITNESS: We had no intentions of carrying on or conducting or entering into an aggressive war.

THE PRESIDENT: You have said that repeatedly.

- Q Then by the words "definite and clear move" which you use here, you do not mean war, is that so?
- A We had to be increasingly ready with our self-defense on account of the actions that Japan

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

was taking. 1 MR. S. OKAMOTO: I am contented with that. Did Secretary Hull regard the Japanese memorandum -- Japanese note of November 20th as an ultimatum? THE PRESIDENT: Did he state it was? THE WITNESS: He did. Q Did other high officials in the State Department besides Secretary Hull also think likewise? THE PRESIDENT: They do not speak for the Department. Only the Secretary does, I take it. THE WITNESS: That is correct. MR. S. OKAMOTO: I shall withdraw that question in accordance with the President's command. Q Did General Marshall and Admiral Stark also consider the Japanese note of November 20th as an ultimatum? THE PRESIDENT: You need not answer. Q When this note was delivered, according to Ambassador NOMURA's oral explanation, you state

in your affidavit that -- on page 13 of your affi-

davit in paragraph 5 -- on page 12 of your affidavit

you have stated that Ambassador NOMURA said that if

an agreement along those lines was not quickly

4 5

concluded, ensuing developments might be most unfortunate. Did the Department of State understand that the word "unfortunate" meant war?

A Well, there was an implication that we considered that Japan might break out with fresh acts of aggression at any time.

Q Did the State Department consider that the Japanese note of November 20th was in the nature of a modus vivendi?

A The Japanese Government suggested that acting on that, we could go further on our conversations. Mr. Hull brought that out clearly in his conversations with Ambassador NOMURA. I believe that Ambassador KURUSU and Ambassador NOMURA replied to the effect that that was so, that if -- that that arrangement, that modus vivendi would make possible the continuance of the conversations.

Q But, according to what is stated at the top of page 13 of your affidavit, you say -- it is stated: "Acceptance by the American Government of the Japanese proposal of November 20 would have meant condonement by the United States of Japan's past aggressions, assent by the United States to unlimited courses of conquest by Japan in the future"... et cetera.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

If this were true, this proposal of the 1 Japanese would be very far from being any proposal 2 of a modus vivendi. Why did the State Department consider the Japanese proposal in such an unfavorable light -- in such a harsh manner? THE PRESIDENT: That is the view of the State Department, I take it? THE 'ITNESS: That is correct. THE PRESIDENT: "ell, he wants your answer. Give it to him. The Japaness proposal by its very nature was such that Japan offered no concessions from the course she was pursuing, and they asked us to make all the concessions. Q Do you mean to say then that Japan never made any concessions from her first proposal? A No material concessions that I could recognize. THE PRESIDENT: Can you suggest any to him? ( Is it not true that, concerning the stationing of troops in China, in all our proposals before November 20th a definite time limit was set in all the plans --

25

THE MONITOR: --which a call the "A" plan?

A Me did not consider that a material concession, especially in the light of the instructions which Ambassacor NOMURA had received from the Foreign Office in regard to the explanation of that matter.

THE MONITOR: I would like to make a correction prior to that. That was not an " 'A' plan" but "proposal 'A'". I will repeat again: Proposal "A".

Q Concorning the Three Power Pact, is it not true that Japan's attitude to the United States was very friendly and that explanations were made to the effect that it would be very unlikely that Japan would enter the war on Germany's side?

THE PRESIDENT: Was anything to that effect said in the course of the negotiations?

Ambassador read a communication to the President.

I think that matter was fully gone over in my provious answers to the question. There was a line deleted by the Japanese Ambassador in that explanation. I do not think I can add to anything that I have already said on that particular point.

C Then what concessions did the United States make towards Japan?

2

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

1.)

14

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A From the very beginning of the conversations we told the Japanese that everything must conform to our fixed principles. We had not asked for any agreement. We never talked to them in terms of the concessions that we would make from our principles. We were ready to come to an agreement if the Japanese wanted to go out on all-out peaceful courses.

Q Then may I understand that the United States, from the very beginning, showed these principles and never permitted of any compromise, any room for compromise concerning these principles?

THE PRESIDENT: You need not add anything to what you have said already. I think you are putting questions now for the sake of putting them. You said you had only a few questions to ask, but you have been here nearly an hour. I will not prevent you from asking any relevant or material question; but you have asked very few that do not involve repetition.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: I shall change my subject. I shall select a few very important points and question you on these.

Q In the draft of the proposal handed from the Secretary of State to the Japanese Ambassador on

June 21st, the English text of this proposal is an exhibit "C" of the witness' statement. On page 2 of exhibit "C" it is stated: "Both Governments declare that it is their traditional and present concept and conviction that nations and races compose as members of a family one household living under the ideal of universal concord through justice and equity."

Does this text state, in English the equivalent of the Japanese ideal of "Hakko ichiu"?

THE PRESIDENT: You need not answer that.

You are not here as an expert on Japanese. It is
quite beyond your province.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: Mr. President, that may be so, but this witness is an expert in the Japanese language; and I believe -- I wish to ascertain whether the philosophies of East and West meet on this point. I believe that it is a question appropriate to this Tribunal as it is a very important matter, and I should be very happy if I could be permitted to make this -- put this question.

THE PRESIDENT: Put it to some other witness who will be competent to enswer. You are confined to cross-examining this witness on the statements of

fact in his affidavit. That is the result of a 1 rule made in the United States and applied by this Tribunal. Please get out of your head that 3 I have any discretion. I have not. 5 MR. S. OKAMOTO: Then I shall put my 6 question this way: 7 Q I believe that the witness must have been one of those who participated in the drafting of this proposal of June 21st. 10 A I was present, yes. 1: Q Was this text written in such a way that 12 it would be on English interpretation of the 13 traditional Japanese ideal of "Hakko ichiu"? 14 THE PRESIDENT: You need not answer that. 15 [ Finally, I should like to ask you just one more question concerning the anti-Japanese 17 movement in America. 18 THE MONITOR: Anti-Japanese activities 19 in America. 20 (Continuing): In 1913, when a law 21 prohibiting the buying or renting of land by 22 unnaturalized foreigners was presented to the Cali-23 fornia State Legislature -- foreigners who are not 24 able to become naturalized -- are you aware of the

fact that Prosident Tilson, accepting the protests

of the Japanese Government, sent Secretary Bryan to Socramento, the capital of California, in order to prevent the passage of this law, but was unsuc-cessful? THE PRESIDENT: You do not know that as a State Department official, do you? A I do not know about that. THE PRESILENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes. ("hereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:) 

M D 1	ine international
2	Military Washaman
3	MIII DDF
4	100
6	(Whomeway )
	(Whereupon, the last answer was read
7	by the official court reporter as follows: "I
8	don't know about that.")
9	BY MR. S. OKAMOTO (Continued):
10	Q This was a most important point in the American-
11	Japanese negotiations. Even if you didn't know of it
12	directly, did you not learn of it through the records
13	of the State Department or through other documents?
14	A The matter is not
5	A The matter is not covered in my affidavit. I
6	did not have occasion to go through the Department's
7	records to study that subject.
8	Q Did you know it as did you not know it as
9	a matter of common knowledge in foreign affairs?
	THE PRISIDENT: The witness is not required
	to answer. This Tribunal is not obliged to tolerate
	even Japanese counsel insisting upon not observing
	the rules.
-	MR. S. OKAMOTO: I holiowa the
	MR. S. OKAMOTO: I believe that my what I
	should do in this case is to observe strictly the
1	imits of the offidevit. What are the rules I should

observe? I believe that it is that I should stay within the limits of the affidavit. THE PRESIDENT: I have said so repeatedly. 3 MR. S. OKAMOTO: Then may I not question him 4 further concerning enti-Japanese activities in American THE PRESIDENT: No, except in so far as they are right within some statement of fact in his affidavit. MR. S. OKAMOTO: In the offidavit it is stated that friendly relations with Japan were maintained. I wish, therefore, to question a statement from the witness concerning the fact that the original fissure -the original thing which brought the cleavage in the friendly relations was the anti-Japanese policy 13 14 pursued by America. THE PRESIDENT: You have already described 15 16 that as a matter of common knowledge. If you think so there is no need to ask this witness any question 18 relating to it. 19 ? Was there a movement persecuting Japanese school children in San Francisco just after the Russo-21 Japanese War? 22 THE PRESIDENT: That is beyond the scope of 23 the affidavit. MR. S. OKAMOTO: I conclude my cross-examin-

24 25

etion.

MR. LOGAN: There will be no further cross-1 examination, your Honor. 2 MR. KEENAN: Mr. President. 3 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief of Counsel. 4 MR. KIENAN: The next witness will be Admiral Richardson, United States Navy, who will be examined 6 by Captain Robinson of the United States Navy. THE PRESIDENT: There will be no re-examination 8 of this wintess? 9 10 MR. KEENAN: No re-examination. 11 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Ballantine is released 12 es a witness on the usual terms. 13 (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) 14 15 THE PRESIDENT: Captain Robinson. 16 CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Mr. President and Members 17 of the Tribunal: 18 It is now proposed to present evidence to 19 show plans and preparations made by the Japanese Navy 20 leading up to the naval hostilities which Japan initi-21 ated and wased at Pearl Harbor on 7 December 1941. 22 This evidence is offered in proof of the violations 23 of international law charged in the Indictment, partic-

larly in Appendix A, Section 5(a), charging Japanese

neval preparation for wars of aggression, and in

24

Counts 20 and 29 charging Crimes against Feace, Count 37 charging Conspiracy to Murder, and Count 39 charging Murder.

May the witness, Admiral Richardson, be called to the witness stand.

JAMES O. RICHARDSON, Admirel, USN (Ret.), called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

#### BY CAPTAIN ROBINSON:

Will you state your name, rank, and present station

A James O. Richardons, Admiral, United States
Navy, Retired, on duty in the Office of the Chief of
Naval Operations, Navy Department, temporarily assigned
to duty with the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers
in connection with this Tribunal.

In the course of this duty have you prepared, on the basis of records in the Navy Department, a statement on matters in question here, namely, the plans and preparations made by the Japanese Navy leading up to the navel hostilities which the Japanese initiated and waged at Pearl Harbor on 7 December 1941?

...

1 Yes 2 Before presenting that statement, will you 3 answer some questions bearing upon your previous 4 service, trainin and experience in the United States 5 Navy? 6 A Yes. 7 How long have you been in the service of the 8 United States Navy, particularly in the Pacific area? 9 Sirce 1898. 10 You graduated from the United States Naval 11 Academy in 1902? 12 A Yes. 13 Upon graduation from the Academy you were 14 ordered to the United States Asiatic Floet and on 29 15 June 1902 you arrived in Manila Bay? 16 A Yes. 17 Your answer, Admiral? 18 Yes. A 19 And after service in the Philippines and on 20 the North China Coast, you were in Javan from September 21 to December, 1903, and later at Yokohama from February 22 to l'ay, 1904? 23 24

OR.

	A Yes.
	C You were at Wallaham to war and the
3	
4	and you observed the departure of the Russian Hinister,
5	the mobilization of sections of the Japanese army, and
6	saw Japanese news bulletins telling of the Japanese
7	attack on Russian forces off Port Arthur and at
8	Chemulpo?
9	A That is correct.
10	Q You later commanded the USS ASHEVILLE off
11	the /sistic Corst?
12	A Yes, from Sentember, 1922, to Arch, 1924.
13	Q You were in command, during part of that time,
14	of the South China Patrol with headquarters at Canton?
15	A Yes, from 5 August 1923 to 15 Morch 1924.
16	Q You later commanded the USS AUGUSTA in the
17	Pacific area?
18	A Yes, from June 1931 to May, 1933.
19	Q You were assigned to the United States Maval
20	Var College for duty under instruction in 1933 and 1934?
21	A Yes; yes.
22	Q At the War College you made a special study of
23	Japanese political policy and naval strategy?
24	A That is correct.
25	And, as part of that course, did you premare

and submit a thesis on the subject: "The Relationship between Japanese Policy and Strategy in the Chinese and Russian Wars, and its Lessons to Us?" A That is correct. Q Was this subject assigned to you or did you select it because of your interest in Japanese political policy and nevel strategy as aroused by your observations and strengthened by your study over a period of many years? A I selected that subject for special study and report because of my interest in the subject. And in this thesis or report on that subject you worked out and stated your conclusions as they were at that time? A Yes, I wrote out my conclusions as they were at that time. Q You were again at sea in the Pacific from 1935 to 1937? A Yes. Q During these years you were successivly Commander of a Cruiser Division, later Chief of Staff, United States Fleet, and later Commander of the destroyers of the scouting force?

24

A Yes.

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Q Will you state the five senior positions in

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

in the command of the United States Navy?

Of course, the President of the United States, as the head of our nation is made by the United States Constitution the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy. Under the President as head of the Naval establishment, is a civilian Cabinet officer, the Secretary of the Nevy. These two civilian officials and their civilian associates are responsible for the determination of the policy of the United States.

Next, as principal naval advisor to the President and to the Secretary of the Navy, is the Chief of Naval Operations who, as the commanding head of the Navy is responsible for the execution of the naval policy determined by higher authorities. Next in commend at that time was the Commender-in-Chief, United States Fleet; and next in command under him was Commander, Battle Force, United States Fleet, who commanded the heavier ships of the fleet.

When did you serve as Assistant Chief of Naval Operations?

A From June, 1937, to June, 1938.

In connection with your official naval duties at that time, and particularly at the time of the sinking of the USS PANAY on 12 December 1937, were you in close touch with the activities of Japan in Chine?

19 20

21 22

23

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

6

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, I recognize 1 that these are preliminary questions, but I think we 2 are reaching a stage now if Captain Richardson intends 3 to ask any more questions with regard to the Admiral's 4 activities they should not be put in leading form and conclusions. 6 THE PRESIDENT: I gave the idmiral permission 7 to put the whole of his statement in writing, noting 8 on behalf of the Tribunal. CAPTAIN ROBINSON: These are proliminary 10 introductory questions, sir. I have just one or two 12 more. B / CAPTAIN ROBINSON (Continued): Q From 1938 to 1939 you were Chief of the Bureau 14 of Nevigrtion, now the Bureau of Naval Personnel? 15 16 Yes. 1. When were you Commander, Battle Force, United St tes Pleet? In 1939 and 1940. Q Were you Commander-in-Chief of the United States Fleet? When were you Commender-in-Chief of the United States Fleet? A From January, 1940, until 1 February 1941.

3

4

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

During what part of that period was the United States Fleet based at Pearl Herbor? A From 1ste April, 1940, until 1 February 1941. Since 1 February 1941 have you had any naval commend responsibilities or any other official responsibilities in connection with the relations of the United States with Japan, either before or during the war? A. None whatever. Will you please state the authority under which you have been designated to appear as a witness before this Tribunal and will you now present the statement which you have prepared in compliance with that designation? MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, the objections of the defense to this statement and its use have been fully made heretofore in Chambers. At this time we merely wish to renew the objections made and the ressons therefor at that time. THE PRESIDENT: The objection is overruled. CAPTAIN ROBINSON: I should like to say, your Honor, in that connection that in recordance with the Court's direction the prosecution deliverd to members

of defense counsel on 6 September 1946, two and a half

months ago, copies of the statement to some five members

of defense counsel, and on 6 November the prosecution

left copies with the rest of the defense counsel in 1 accordance with the Court's order. 2 Now, may it place the Court, I produce the 3 witness' statement, IPS document No. 6257, and ask 4 that the clerk give it an exhibit number for identi-5 fication only. After the witness has testified, I shall then present the statement in evidence, modified to agree with the oral presentation of the witness. 9 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 6257 will receive exhibit No. 1249 for identification 10 11 only! 12 (Thereupon, the document above referred 13 to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1249 for 14 identifiertion.) 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon.

the moment, Mr. President, is the degree of expertness of this witness in relation to the subject matter of his affidavit. I realize that he must give his testimony before the Tribunal is able to decide whether he is the type of expert that should have reached the conclusions contained therein. Since we have heard the qualifying statements of the witness, may I respectfully request that the Tribunal rule as to the type of expert they consider the witness to be immediately upon the conclusion of his testimony?

at which we should decide. upon the expertness or otherwise of a witness has been already discussed. I have british and american authorities which I shall produce if necessary to the effect that the expertness of the witness could be determined at this stage before he gives his evidence, but I think you had better allow him to proceed and I can discuss the matter with my colleagues. We have a discretion in the matter. My reading of the law is that the Court has a discretion to determine the expertness of the witness as a preliminary matter or to leave

E .1
d 2
e r 3
& 4
A 5

b

r

a

it until after his evidence is given. In my own court in Australia we determine it as a preliminary matter. I understand in New Zealand it is otherwise, and perhaps the practice in other courts represented here or other countries represented here differs.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: The witness will please proceed.

THE WITNESS: In order to avoid any misunderstanding, I wish to stress the fact that I am testifying neither as an expert witness, stating opinions, nor as a witness stating facts within his own knowledge, but I am simply presenting information contained in official records of the Navy Department of the United States on this one subject, namely, the plans and preparations made by the Japanese Navy leading up to naval hostilities which the Japanese initiated and waged at Pearl Harbor on 7 December 1941. Because of the foregoing reasons and to avoid any possible contention that a few words in my prepared statement are statements of opinion, I shall omit those few words from my oral testimony, as I shall indicate at the appropriate place in presenting that testimony. (heading)

"1. In response to the request of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, dated 31 May 1946,

7

17 18

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

10

20

21

22

23

the Secretary of the Navy on 25 July 1946 designated me to appear as a witness before this Tribunal to present information in regard to documents in the custody of the Navy Department bearing on one subject only.

- "2. I proceeded to consult official naval reports, records and documents made or kept by officers acting in the course of official duties and in accordance with established naval procedure in investigating, recording and reporting facts which are matters of concern to the United States. This statement, as I have stated, "is a report to this Tribural of my investigation of those records which bear upon the subject of the plans and preparations made by the Japanese havy leading up to the naval hostilities which Japan initiated and waged on and after 7 December 1941. This subject will be presented under four headings, as follows:
- "(1) The plans and preparations concerned with naval construction, particularly construction of aircraft carriers.
- "(2) The plans and preparations concerned with the establishment of naval bases and the erection of fortifications in the Landated Islands.
  - "(3) The plans and preparations concerned with

"(4) The plans and preparations for sec-

"(4) The plans and preparations for secret attack by Japanese aircraft carrier task force upon the United States naval personnel and ships at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, on 7 December 1941, without notification having been given by Japan to the United States that there would be a commencement of hostilities in a war by Japan against the United States."

In the last statement I have omitted the words which appear in my prepared statement, namely: "by a previous, explicit and reasoned warning."

(Reading):

шT

"The plans and preparations concerned with naval construction, particularly construction of aircraft carriers.

"The aircraft carrier was recognized as early as 1934 by the Japanese navel leaders, Admiral Iscroku YAMAMOTO and Admiral Osami NAGANO to be the best type of naval arm for expansion and aggression. This is shown by the following records of statements made by them."

CAPTAIN HOBINSON: If the Court please, at this point 1 offer in evidence IPS document No. 6250. It is entitled "Memorandum of Conversations between

the American and Japanese Delegations, October 29, 1934, at Claridges." The certificate attached shows that the document is part of the official records of the Navy Department, dealing with the London Naval Conference of 1935. The sentence to be quoted is at the middle of page 3. I offer the document in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COUNT: Prosecution's document

No. 6250 will receive exhibit number 1250.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 1250 and received in evidence.)

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: The witness will now continue at paragraph 4.

THE WITNESS: (heading)

"4. This official Japanese position that aircraft carriers were essentially what they called
'offensive' or aggressive naval arms was stated by
Admiral YAMAMOTO and by Admiral NAGANO at meetings
connected with the London Naval Conference of 1935.
YAMAMOTO, who, seven years later, was to be the
Commander-in-Chief of the Japanese Combined Fleet in
the Pearl Harbor aircraft carrier attack, took the
position at a meeting of the American and Japanese

delegations on 29 October 1934 that Japan should not be suspected of having aggressive designs in the Far East. In supporting this position, YAMAMOTO said that the Japanese, in fact, were willing to abolish aircraft carriers -- upon terms which the Japanese would consider satisfactory to themselves -- whereas, he said, 'If they (the Japanese) had aggressive designs in the For East, nothing would be more useful than the retention of aircraft carriers.'

"5. Admiral NAGANO, the leader of the Japanese delegation in the London Conference, who was soon to become Japanese Navy Minister and later, at the time of the Pearl Harbor aircraft carrier attack, to be the Chief of the Japanese Naval General Staff, speaking at an official session of the London Conference on 15 January 1936, stated again the Japanese view that aircraft carriers were the principal type of aggressive naval arms. NAGANO said," as shown in the middle of page 3 of the exhibit just introduced, "In order to establish as complete a state of non-aggression and non-menace as possible, we advocate\*\*\*\*\*the abolition of aircraft carriers,' and a drastic reduction in capital ships and "A" Class cruisers."

y

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Now, if the Court please, 1 I present IFS document No. 6251. It is a book en-2 titled, "The Department of State Conference Series No. 24. THE LONDON NAVAL CONFERENCE 1935. 4 I request that the Clerk give this document 6 a court exhibit number for identification only. 7 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 8 No. 6251 will receive exhibit No. 1251, for identi-9 fication only. 10 (whereupon, the document above mer-11 tioned was marked prosecution's exhibit 12 No. 1251 for identification.) 13 CAPTAIN ROBINSON: I now offer in evidence 14 IPS document 6251-A, an excerpt from court exhibit 15 1251 marked for identification only. The excerpt 16 consists of four pages. It is presented to show 17 the statement of the accused NAGANO, at the middle 18 of page 3 of the document. 19 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 20 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 21 No. 6251-A will receive exhibit No. 1251-A. 22 ("hereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's 24

exhibit No. 1251-A and received in evidence.)

23

0

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: The witness will please continue at paragraph 5.

THE WITNESS:

"5. Admiral NAGANO, the leader of the Japanese delegation in the London Conference, who was soon to become Japanese Navy Minister and later, at the time of the Pearl Harbor aircraft carrier attack, to be the Chief of the Japanese Maval General Staff, speaking at an official session of the London Conference on 15 January 1936, stated again the Japanese view that aircraft carriers were the principal typeof aggressive naval arms. NAGANO said," as shown in the middle of page 3 of the exhibit just introduced, "'In order to establish as complete a state of non-aggression and non-menace as possible, we advocate \*\*\* the abolition of aircraft carriers, ' and a drastic reduction in capital ships and A class cruisers.

21

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

"6. The official naval leadership and the personal cooperation of NACANO and YAMAMOTO are indicated not only by their joint efforts in connection with the London Naval Conference, but also by the fact that NACANO and YAHAMOTO for a considerable period in 1936-1937 served together as Navy Minister and Vice Minister, respectively, and later, in 1941-1943, as Chief of the Japanese Naval General Staff and Commender-in-Chief of the Combined Fleet, respectively, the positions in which they took the lead in working out the plans and in issuing the orders for the Pearl Harbor attack.

The records further show that NAG/NO and YAMAMOTO and their associates made the construction and use of aircraft carriers a central principle of Japanese navel policy. The execution of this policy involved three steps: first, the abolition of existing treaty limitations on the construction of aircraft carriers, both quantitatively and qualitatively, and the removal of the treaty barrier to secrecy in navel construction; second, the construction of aircraft carriers and supporting navel units until Japan had carrier supremacy over the United States; and third, the use of an aircraft carrier task force for making a secret, sudden attack to destroy

25

before the war began the men and ships of the United States Pacific Fleet while the ships were lying at anchor or moorings in Pearl Harbor.

The first ster, namely the abolition of 118 existing treaty limitations on the construction of sircraft cerriers, was carried out under the naval leadership of YAMAMOTO and NAGANO as Japanese naval representatives attending the meetings connected with the London Nevel Conference. The Washington Treaty of 1922 had limited Jaman by ratio to a total carrier tonnege of 81,000 tons. The Jananese representatives demanded the abolition of the existing treaty limitations on naval construction. The Japanese demanded in place of the existing ratio or proportional limitations a treaty limitation based on what they called 'a common upper limit.' The other nations considered that the adoption of the proposal would result in the abclition of any limitation rather than in the maintenance of any effective limitation. None of the other nations agreed with the Japanese demands. The Japanese gave notice on 29 December 1934 of their intention to terminate the treaty under its terms to take effect 31 Jecember 1936. On 16 January 1936, led by Admiral NAGANO, the Japanese withdrew from the conference, refusing to join

the other nations in the formulation of a new treaty to limit naval construction.

Under the provisions of the "sshington Tresty of 1922 and the London Tresty of 1930, Japan, the United States and Great Britain had been exchanging reports on their navel construction. When not bound by these treaty provisions because of her termination thereof, Japan, in communications which included letters exchanged in 1938 between Foreign Minister HIROTA and Ambassador Grew, rejected American, Pritish, and French proposals for the reciprocal exchange of information on navel construction. Japan, however, continued to obtain extensive information in regard to navel construction in the United States by methods including consular espionage which will be considered later.

"10. As the second step in Japanese naval nolicy, the Japanese Navy and Covernment between 1936 and 1941 proceeded with an expanded program of aircraft carrier construction. In 1936, Japan had four carriers, with a tonnage of 68,400 tons. By 7 December 1941, however, only five years later, Japan had more than doubled her carrier strength, having ten carriers, with a total tennage of 178,070 tons."

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"ll. In addition to increases in aircraft carrier construction, Japan, between 1931 and 1941, increased her heavy cruisers from eight in 1931 to eighteen in 1941, destroyers from fifty-two to 102, and submarines from forty-four to seventy-four. During the same period, the United States facing increasing naval responsibilities in two oceans brought its total number of heavy cruisers from ten to eighteen, the same number as Japan, while the number of destroyers dropped from 225 to 171, and the number of submarines increased from eighty-one to 112. By way of comparison in aircraft carriers, in the years 1934 and 1936, when Admiral YAVAMOTO and Admiral NAGANO, respectively, made the statements at the London Naval Conference as quoted above, the Japanese Navy and the United States Navy each had four aircraft carriers. On 7 December 1941, whereas Japan had ten aircraft carriers, the United States had only six and only three of them were in the Pacific.

"12. The third and final step in the execution of the Japanese naval policy with regard to the construction and use of aircraft carriers was the use made by Japan of an aircraft carrier task force as the attacking force in the Pearl Harbor attack. The six carriers which the Japanese sent against Pearl

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

A)

Harbor, namely, KAGA, AKAGI, SORYU, HIRYU, SHOKAKU and ZUIKAKU, were the Japanese Navy's most powerful carriers. They constituted 75% of the Japanese Navy's entire carrier strength, and they sent into the attack 360 planes, constituting possibly 75% of the total Japanese carrier plane strength. The maximum total number of carrier based planes which the United States naval forces could have mustered if the two carriers then in the Hawaiian area, namely the USS LEXINGTON and the USS ENTIRPRISE, had been at Pearl Harbor would have been approximately 180. In other words, Japanese naval construction of aircraft carriers between 1936 and 1941 enabled Japan to sent against the United States Navy's men and ships at Pearl Harbor one of the most powerful task forces ever assembled up to that time, with overwhelming carrier air force supremacy over the naval forces attacked. Moreover, a principal target and objective of the Japanese Navy in making the attack was to destroy the two United States carriers based at Pearl Harbor, and thereby to increase the already predominant Japanese carrier supremacy in the Pacific.

"13. To summarize, Japanese plans and preparations concerned with naval construction between

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1931 and 1941 were characterized by the express recognition by NAGANO and YAMAMOTO, leading Japanese naval authorities, that aircraft carriers were the principal type of naval construction for conducting aggressive naval warfare, and by the termination by Japan of existing treaty limitations on the construction of carriers and other naval arms. Japanese naval plans and preparations, moreover, featured the construction of aircraft carriers until in 1941 Japan had attained decisive supremacy over the United States and other nations in aircraft carriers. And finally, as the climax of her naval policy of expansion and aggression, Japan on 7 December 1941, used an aircraft carrier task force to make a sudden, secret attack designed to annihilate United States naval power in the Pacific before war had actually been declared."

THE PRESIDENT: At this stage I had better refer to the authorities that I mentioned earlier.

Underhill's Criminal Evidence, Fourth Edition, page 440, section 236. "Before experts testify their knowledge and experience should ordinarily be inquired into, so that the Court may determine their competency." Similar statements appear in "harton's Criminal Evidence, Eleventh Edition, page 1709, and

1

30

18

20

21 22

23

American Jurisprudence, page 659. Nevertheless, without prejudice the defense could postpone their cross-examination on expertness until after the examination in chief has been given. They may decide to follow that course here. Expertness goes not to admissibility, really, but to weight only, strangely enough. That appears at Underhill, at the page I have stated.

We will adjourn now until half past one. ("hereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

, 18

Folf & Duda		AFTERNOON SESSION
	1	The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess,
	2	at 1330.
	3	MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
	4	Military Tribunal for the For East is now resumed.
	5	
	6	JAMES O. RICHARDSON, colled as a
	7	witness on buhalf of the prosecution, resumed
	8	the stand and testified as follows:
	9	DIRECT EXALINATION (Continued)
	10	THE PRESIDENT: Captain Robinson.
	11	CAPTAIN ROBINSON: May the witness proceed,
	12	your Honor?
	13	THE PRESIDENT: Yes.
	14	TUE WITNESS: (Reading)
	15	
	16	"II
	17	"The plans and preparations concerned with the establishment of naval bases and the
	18	crection of fortifications in the Mandated Islands.
	19	
	20	"14. Documentary evidence will now be pre-
	21	sented which indicates that the Japanese naval policy
	22	with respect to the Mandated Islands was characterized
	23	by the same objectives as those with respect to the
	24	Japanese naval policy on aircraft carriers, namely,
	25	to develop and use them for naval expansion and

aggression.

"15. The execution of this policy likewise was along the same lines of activity as those
which were pursued in the execution of the policy
with respect to aircraft carriers, namely, (1) the
termination, or in this case, the direct violation
of treaty limitations, (2) the construction of fortifications and of naval bases in the Islands, and
(3) the use of the Islands'fortifications and bases
in initiating and waging naval hostilities against
the United States and her allies on and after 7 December 1941.

"16. The treaty and mandate limitations were established (1) by the Treaty of Versailles (1920), (2) by the mandate of the Islands to Japan pursuant to the Treaty and (3) by the Mandates treaty between the United States and Japan (1922). These limitations are stated as follows:

'...no military or naval bases shall be established or fortifications erected in the territory' of the Mandated Islands.

"17. Numerous documents show that the Japanese Navy and Government established naval bases in
the Mandated Islands, but for the sake of brevity
and because of its adequacy, only one of them is

presented. That document is the Japanese Navy's Combined Fleet Top Secret Operation Order No. 1. (IPS Document No. 17)"

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Now, if the Court please, I offer in evidence IPS document No. 17, entitled "Combined Fleet Top Secret Operation Orders No. 1, No. 2 and No. 7." To this document is attached the certificate of the appropriate official of the Japanese Government showing that the original document was part of the official files of the Japanese Combined Fleet Feedquarters aboard the Battleship Magato, and part of the official files of the Japanese Navy Ministry.

Also attached is the contificate of Lieutenant Robert I. Curts. Paragraphs 3 and 4 of this certificate will now be read with the purpose chiefly of indicating the circumstances under which the custody has been obtained of the first and fundamental operational order under which the Japanese Mavy prepared for and commenced hostilities in 1941.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the contificate read as follows:

"3. The Japanese cruiser NACHI--"

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Presecution's document

No. 17 will be marked exhibit No. 1252.

(whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit

No. 1252, and was received in evidence.) CAPTAIN ROBINSON: May I proceed, sir, with the certificate? May I proceed reading the certificate? 3 THE PRESIDENT: Yos. 4 CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Mes, sir. 5 (Rending) 6 The Ja anese cruiser NACHI was sunk in Manila 7 113. Bay 5 Movember 1944 by planes from the USS LEXINGTON. 8 In the latter part of March, 1945, remorts by pilots of sircraft attached to the LEXINGTON were used in 10 11 obtaining a rough fix of the location of the NACHI. 12 A search was made by YP 421 which located and buoyed 13 the wreck. A special party of officers including 14 Lieutenant (jg) Albert Altman, USNR, and myself, was 15 sent as an Intelligence team from the Fleet Intel-16 ligence Center, Menile, for the purpose of obtaining 17 the ships' papers from the hull of the MACHI. On 2 18 April 1945, which was the third day after the begin-

ning of diving operations, salvage divers brought up

from the NACHI a bundle wrapped in burlap which they

had found in the charthouse of the NACHI. Upon sur-

facing, the divers delivered the hundle to Lieutenant

crash boat and delivered it to our Intelligence Team

Altman and me. "e took the bundle to Manila in a

Headcuarters at 77 Delpan Street, Manila, on the

20

22

23

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

night of 2 April 1945. The bundle was then onened by myself, Lieutenent (jr) Altmen, Lieutenent (jg) B. R. Carlson, and Licutement (jp) C. V. Mattles. "e made a precis of the MICHI documents contained in the bundle. We then stored the documents in mril begs and had them taken to Tolosa by Lieutenant Lawrence F. 1bb, USME. We then transferred the bags to Centein Arthur H. McCollum, USF, the 7th Fleet Intelligence O ficer, who crused the documents to be microfilmed because they were in an advanced stage of deterioration resulting from prolonged immersion in selt water. Cantain McCollum then forwarded the peners and the copy of the micro-film to /11ied Translator and Interrater Section, E Fr. (LTIS), Prishene, Austrelia, where they were received by Colonel Siency F. Meshbir for ATIS. He caused translations from Japanese to english to be made of all of the MICHI documents. The ITIS translations were published as Limited Fistribution Translation 39, Firts I to XII, of which Firt VIII includes Combined Fleet Top Secret Operation Order No. 1 and Order No. 2. ITIS then (in July, 1945) forwarded the papers and the micro-film to the Office Of Naval In-

telligence, Nevy Department, "ashinaton, I. C., where

k,

I received them into my custody. The documents and micro-film remained in my custody until April, 1946, when they erme into the custody of the Mechington Document Center, in charge of Cantain Panson Fullinwider, Steurrt Evilding, 'sshington, D. C., where they are now kept."

The court exhibit number is what, Mr. Clerk? CLERK OF THE COURT: 1252.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: The witness will please continue.

THE VITNESS: (Reading) "18. Admiral YAMAMOTO, as Commmander-in-Chief Combined Fleet, issued this order from his flagship, the NAGATO, on 5 November 1941. That is indicated by page 2/1 of the document just introduced.

"It was an order that 'Combined Fleet
Operations in the war against the United States,
Great Britain, and the Netherlands will be conducted in accordance with the separate volume.'
The separate volume, in 151 pages of text, tables and charts, outlines operations for a war beginning with the attack on Pearl Harbor (shown on pages 2/17 and 2/18). It provides for preparations for war, communications, supply, allocation of forces and other details.

"19. The Mandated Islands appear in many places in this order. At page 2/67 the order establishes an allotment of supply bases. The supply bases allotted to the South Seas Force and the Advanced Expeditionary Force are the following Mandated Islands: SAIPAN, KWAJALEIN,

WOTJE, JALUIT, TAROA, TRUK, PONAPE, and PALAU. These eight bases constitute more than half of the total number of naval supply bases thus allotted, namely a total of fifteen.

"20. At pages 2/76 to 2/78 is an Appended Table 1, giving initial fuel allowances for supply bases. The boiler oil allowance to five of the eight Mandated Island bases totals 46,500 metric tons. Likewise allotted to the Mandate bases are great quantities of aviation fuel, bombs, machine gun ammunition, torpedoes and mines. Rations are allotted for 36,000 persons per month at the eight Mandate bases. Large monthly replenishment allowances are tabulated at pages 2/91 to 2/94. Aircraft material for the South Seas area is to be replenished at TRUK, and submerine material at KWAJALEIN.

"21. No doubt Order No. 1 is accurate in applying the term 'bases' to these Mandate installations. The materials, the quantities and the areas involved indicate that these naval bases and their equipment for storage, transport, communications, and guns and ammunition had been established on a large scale and over a considerable period of time. Other documents on this point are

eveilable for presentation or examination.

"22. The Mandated Islands appear in Order No. 1 also in tables of allocations of forces (pages 2/104, 105, 106). The South Sers Force, centering about the 4th Fleet (commonly called the Mandates Fleet) is allocated for rendezvous the South Seas or Mandated Islands. Operating from these bases it is ordered to aid in covering the withdrawal of the Pearl Harbor striking force, to attack Wake and Guam as quickly as possible, and to cooperate with the striking force in the occupation of strategic areas. Also based in the Mandates is the Commerce Desruction Unit, apparently submarines assigned by the Order to destroy see traffic. Japanese submarines of the 6th Fleet and of other fleets regularly used bases in the Mandates. Submarines en route from Japan to Pearl Harbor rendezvoused at Kwajalein.

"23. It is clear, therefore, that the Japanese Navy before 7 December 1941 had established naval bases in the Mandated Islands.

"24. Likewise many other documents show that the Japanese Navy and Government erected fortifications in the Mandated Islands. For brevity only one set consisting of three documents is pre-

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

23

sented here. Two of these documents (IPS Documents No. 6254-A and No. 6254-B) are aerial reconnaissance photographs of WOTJE Island taken by United States Navy photographic intelligence units in January 1942, less than two months after war began. The third document (IPS Document No. 6254-C) is a Japanese blueprint map of WOTJE dated 10 November 1940 captured by American forces landing at Kwejelein in February 1944."

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: I believe that was 10 August, was it not?

THE WITNESS: 10 August.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: 10 August 1940.

THE VITNESS: 10 August 1940.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: I now offer in evidence, if the Court please, IPS document No. 6254-A, 6254-B, and 6254-C, the two photographs and the blueprint map of Wotje Island.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's documents

No. 6254-A, 6254-B and 6254-C will be given exhibit
No. 1253: 6254-A, 1253-A; 6254-B, 1253-B; and 6254-C, 1253-C.

(Whereupon, the documents above referred to were marked prosecution's exhibits No. 1253-A, 1253-B, and 1253-C, respectively, and were received in evidence.)

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: The witness will now proceed.
THE WITNESS: (Rending)

"25. An examination of these photographs shows that "OTJE, before 31 January 1942, had been fortified and equipped as a combination of a island fortress and a naval base. The blueprint map shows that before 10 August 1940 the Jananese Navy and Covernment had already created extensive fortifications. The magnitude of the Jananese naval installations at "OTJE is indicated by the tables of numbered items attached to each document.

"26. The photograph C-23, "OTJE Island, North End,

(IPS Document No. 6254-A) shows the center of the Island to be covered by two intersecting paved firfield runwrys, each 300 feet wide, one more than a mile long (5700 feet). the other 3900 feet long, and suitable for large land-based bombers as well as lesser sireraft. Two (or three) large hangers and two large, shop-type buildings are seen west of the runways. North of these hangars is a large seablene ramp, with a hanger 150 feet wide by morhans 300 feet long suitable for the largest seaplanes. "27. Many gun positions are seen, including a northern and a southern 3-gun Dual Parnose Anti-Aircraft and Coast Defense Battery each with adjacent power plant, munitions storage, command nost and berracks area. The guns are probably 5-inch or 6inch guns. Numerous blockhouses are observed along the shore in the photographs and map. "28. Storage traks for heavy oil and structures for ammunition storage are indicated on the Japanese man by lettering and also on the photographs by clouds of black smoke showing where U. S. Navy aviators have located the tanks and ammunition storages. Trenches, millboxes, machine gun emplreements, wire entanglements, a connecting system of roads,

plus a total of more than fifty buildings are also

25

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

to be observed on the photographs and map. 1 1130. In photograph C-22 (IPS Document No. 6254-B) are shown the large, two-story radio transmitter 3 buildings, flanked by three radio towers, and by 4 other buildings and tanks. 5 "31. The total volume of installations on "OTJE, 6 as shown by this Japanese map dated 10 August 1940 and by these derial photographs dated 31 January 1942, is sufficient to show that the Japanese Navy and 9 Government had been engaged in establishing the 10 bases and erecting the fortifications at least prior 11 12 to the middle of 1940 and parhaps at least during 13 the entire year 1940 as well as 1941. I am informed 14 that additional evidence on this point has been intro-15 duced in another section of this case in the form of 16 statements from residents of the Islands who worked 17 on the construction at "CTJE for the Japanese. 18 It conerrs that the documents prepared by 19 the Jananese Navy, namely Combined Floot Top Secret 20 Operation Order No. 1 and the Man of VOTJE, are suf-21 ficient to show that the Japanese Navy and Government 22 before 7 December 1941 established neval bases and 23 creeted Cortifications on these islands." 24

"III

## "The plans and preparations concerned with consular espionage as an aid to naval attack.

"33. Numerous documents and records show that the Japanese Navy and Government, particularly the Foreign Office, between 1931 and 1941, were engaged in a policy of surveillance, reconnaissance and espionage with respect to the naval establishment and activities of the United States Navy and Government.

"34. The United States Naval Court of Inquiry on the Pearl Harbor Attack stated, in its findings of fact, that Japan's espionage system utilized her civilian, consular and diplomatic nationals throughout the world and enabled her to keep constantly informed of the United States naval building program and of the location and movements of United States naval vessels.

"35. An extensive continuous espionage was conducted under the direction of the Japanese Navy and Government, particularly the Foreign Office, at Honolulu, through Consul General Nagao KITA and his 200 consular agents scattered throughout the Islands.

"36. Documents which show the nature and extent of this espionage and particularly its heavy contribution to the Pearl Harbor attack, will now be presented. These documents are authenticated copies of

15

16

17

18

21

23

24

some of the messages exchanged between the Japanese Consul General's office at Honolulu and the Japanese Navy and Foreign Office at Tokyo. They were coded messages sent via commercial communication companies."

IPS document No. 6255. It is a book entitled, "Japanese Messages Concerning Military Installations, Ship Movements, Etc." The book is accompanied by the certificate of the naval officer who assisted in preparing it and in introducing it in evidence in the hearings of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Japanese Attack on Pearl Harbor, Congress of the United States. I request the Clerk to give this book a Court exhibit number for identification only.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document
No. 6255 will receive exhibit No. 1254 for identification
only.

(Whereupon, the document above mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1254 for identification.)

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: I now offer in evidence
IPS document No. 6255-A, an excerpt from Court exhibit
No. 1254 marked for identification only. This excerpt,
like the other messages which will be introduced, is
accompanied by the certificates of source and authenticity

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

signed by the appropriate American and Japanese officials, including the former Japanese Consul General at Honolulu, KITA. I now offer the document in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 6255-A will receive exhibit No. 1254-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1254-A and received in evidence.)

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Wall the witness please proceed.

THE "ITNESS: (Reading)

"In order that the messages may be understood in their references to places and areas at Pearl Harbor, a chart of Pearl Harbor has been prepared and will now be offered."

IPS Document No. 6258. It is entitled: "Sketch Map of Pearl Harbor after the Attack of 7 December 1941.

JICPOA D-1071. Showing Areas A,B,C,D, Lochs, and Fatalities in Circles." It is accompanied by certificates of source and authenticity signed by the appropriate officials.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

No. 6258 will receive exhibit No. 1255.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1255 and received in evidence.)

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: If the Court please, enlargements based on this exhibit have been prepared as well maps for the convenience of the Tribunal and others participating here, and, if it please the Tribunal, the court attendants will now roll these wall maps into place.

The map on the right, that is the Court's right or north wall space, is practically an exact duplicate of the hand map, IPS document No. 6258, now Court exhibit No. 1255. The other wall map represents a larger area. The certificates attached to the hand map also show the source and authenticity of the wall maps.

Will the witness please continue with the reading.

THE WITNESS: (Reading)

"The first message (which was just introduced) is from Tokyo, apparently from the Foreign Office because it bears the name of Admiral TOYODA, the Foreign Minister. It reads as follows:

"'From: Tokyo (Toyoda) 1 "'To: Honolulu 2 "'September 24, 1941 3 " 1#83 "'Strictly secret. 5 "'Henceforth, we would like to have you make 6 reports concerning vessels along the following lines 7 in so far as possible: 8 "1. The waters (of Pearl Harbor) are to 9 be divided roughly into five sub-areas. (We have no 10 11 objections to your abbreviating as much as you like.) 12 "'Area A. Waters between Ford Island and the 13 arsenal. 14 "'Area B. Waters adjacent to the Island south 15 and west of Ford Island. (This area is on the opposite 16 side of the Island from Area A.) 17 "'Area C. East Loch. 18 "'Area D. Middle Loch. 19 "'Area E: West Loch and the communicating 20 water routes. 21 "12. With regard to warships and aircraft 22 carriers, we would like to have you report on those at 23 anchor, (these are not so important) tied up at wharves, buoys and in docks. (Designate types and classes

briefly. If possible we would like to have you make

mention of the fact when there are two or more vessels along side of same wharf.) "" 

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: I now offer in evidence 1 IPS document No. 6255-C with the appropriate certificates. THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 3 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 6255-C will be given exhibit No. 1256. 5 (Whereupon, the document above 6 referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1256, and was received in evidence.) 8 CAPTAIN ROBINSON: The witness will please 9 continue. 10 THE WITNESS: (Ronding) "The next message 11 (just introduced) from Tokye, apparently is another 12 Foreign Office message as it bears the name of Foreign 13 Minister TOGO. It reads as follows: 14 "\*From: Tokyo (TOGO). To: Monolulu (RIYOJI). 15 "'15 Movember 1941. #111. 16 "'As relations between Japan and the United 17 18 States are most critical, make your ships in harbor 19 report" irregular, but at a rate of wice a week. 20 Although you already are no doubt arers, please take 21 extra care to maintain secrecy." 22 CAPTAIN ROBINSON: I now offer in evidence IPS document No. 6255-D, from the same source. 24 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 25 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

3

5

6

7

9

11 12

13

14

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

No. 6255-D will be given exhibit No. 1257.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1257, and was received in evidence.)

THE WITNESS: "The next message (just introduced) illustrates the type of information which the Japanese Consul General was sending to Tokyo less than a month before Pearl Harbor. It reads as follows:

"'From: Honolulu (KITA). To: Tokyo.

"'Nevember 18, 1941. #222.

on the 15th were as I told you in my (219 on that day.

entered and one tanker left port.

"Area C - 3 varships of the heavy cruiser class were at anchor.

the harbor. The carrier, Enterprise, or some other vessel was in Area C. Two heavy cruisers of the Chicago class, one of the Pensacola class were tied up at Docks "KS." 4 merchant vessels were at anchor in Area D.

17th, 8 destroyers were observed entering the Harbor.
Their course was as follows: In a single file at a distance of 1,000 meters apart at a speed of 3 knots

```
per hour, they moved into Pearl Harbor. From the
    entrance of the Harbor through Area B to the buoys in
    Area C, to which they were moored they changed course
   5 times each time roughly 30 degrees. The elepsed time
   was one hour, however, one of these destroyers entered
    Area A after passing the water reservoir on the
   Eastern side."
 7
            CAPTAIN ROBINSON: If the Court please, I
 9 now offer in evidence IPS document To. 6255-E, the
10
   same source.
11
            THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
12
            CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document
13
   No. 6255-E will receive exhibit No. 1258.
14
                 (Whereupon, the document above
15
        referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
16
       No. 1258, and was received in evidence.)
17
            WE WITHESS: "The next message (just intro-
  duced) raises three important questions preparatory
19
  to the Pearl Harbor attack. It likewise bears the name
20
  of Foreign Minister TOGO and thereby indicates close
21
  linison between the Japanese Foreign Office and the
22
  apanese Havy. It reads as follows:
23
           "'From: Tokyo (TOGO). To: Monolulu.
24
           "'December 2, 1941. Explanatory Note: (Trans-
25
  ated by Army, 30 December 1941).
```

"'J-19. #123. (Secret outside the department)."

I believe that it is an explanatory note.

"'In view of the present situation, the

presence in port of warships, airplane carriers, and
cruisers is of utmost importance. Hereafter, to the

utmost of your ability, let me know day by day. Wire

me in each case whether or not there are any observation balloons above Pearl Harbor or if there are any
indications that they will be sent up. Also advise me
whether or not the warships are previded with anti-mine
nets.!"

LIRECT

1

8

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: If the Court please, I now offer in evidence IPS documents Nos. 6256-A, 6256-B, entitled respectively "Affidavid of Otto Kuehn dated 1 Jan. 1942," and Affidavit of Otto Kuehn dated January 3, 1941 (1942). Appropriate certificates are attached.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

PR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, with respect to both of these exhibits, the document which the prosecution is offering is a photostatic copy, is apparently not an original document, and the upper right-hand corner and the lower right-hand corner of page 1 of each of those documents have been cut out. We do not know what was contained in each of these corners nor who cut them cut.

THE PRESIDENT: That does not render them inadmissible, but it may be made the subject of cross-examination.

Admitted on the usual terms.

No. 6256-A will be given exhibit No. 1259, and document No. 6256-B will be given exhibit No. 1260.

(Whereupon, the documents above referred to were marked respectively prosecution's exhibits Nos. 1259 and 1260 and received

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

19

20

21

22

24

25

in evidence.)

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Witness, will you please continue.

THE WITNESS (Reading continued): "On the same day as the date of the preceding Japanese message, namely 2 December 1941, Bernard Julius Otto Kuehn, according to his recorded confession, (IPS document No. 6256-A and B, now prosecution's exhibits Nos. 1259 and 1260, respectively) which has been presented in evidence, delivered to Consul-General KITA and his assizuants at his office in Honolulu information and documents as requested by the Consul-General. The confession also indicates that Kuehn was paid a considerable sum of money, apparently not less than \$10,000, for his services in providing such information to the Japanese Consul-General and, therefore, in turn to the Japanese Navy and Foreign Office at Tokyo. The information and papers delivered by Kuehn included full details of United States ships present, with their berthing locations in the harbor, and also a comprehensive code of signals by which such information could be communicated to Japanese submarines or other Japanese naval units then en route to Pearl Harbor.

The Kuehn code, repeated practically verbatim

DIRECT

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: If the Court please, I
now offer in evidence IPS document No. 6255-F.
It is another message another excerpt from the .
original source of these messages marked for identi-
fication.
THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document
No. 6255-F will receive exhibit No. 1261.
(Whereupon, the document above
referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 1261 and received in evidence.)
THE WITNESS (Reading continued): "The
Lanikai Beach House and Kalama House mentioned in
the message were houses occuried by Kuehn, according
to his confession. This message (IPS Document No.
6255-F, Prosecution Exhibit No. 1261 Japanese
Message #245) reads as follows:
"'From: Honolulu (KTTA)
"'To: Tokyo
"'3 December 1941'
Explanatory note: "'(Translated by Navy
11 December 1941) (PA-K2)
"1#245 (in 2 parts, complete)
"'(Military secret).
"From Ichiro FUJII to the Chief of #3 Section

```
of Military Staff Headquarters.
 1
               "11 I wish to change my method of communi-
 2
    cating by signals to the following:
 3
               "'l. Arrange the eight signals in three
 4
    columns as follows:
 5
               One is headed "Meaning" and explanation of
 6
 7
    the signal:
    Battleship divisions
                                                                 Signal
 8
                                    Preparing to sortie
    including scouts and
 9
    screen units
10
                                     Preparing to sortie All departed between
    A number of carriers
11
                                     1st and 3rd
    Battleship divisions
                                     Several departed
12
    Carriers
                                     between 1st and 3rd
                                     All departed between
13
                                     1st and 3rd
All departed between
    Carriers
14
                                                                    6
    Battleship divisions
                                     4th and 6th
Several departed
15
                                     between 4th and 6th
    Carriers
                                     All departed between
16
                                     4th and 6th
                                                                    8
    Carriers
17
               1112.
                      Signals.
18
                      1. Lanikai Beach House will show lights
19
    during the night as follows:
20
                                                            Signal
               "'One light between 8 and 9 p.m.
"' " 9 and 10 p.m.
"' " 10 and 11 p.m.
"' " 11 and 12 p.m.
21
                                                                2
22
23
                              " 'II
24
               "'Two lights between 12 and 1 a.m.
25
              11 11 11 11
                                         1 and 2 a.m.
                                  11
                                         2 and 3 a.m.
```

	64
1	"Two lights between 3 and 4 a.m. Signal 8
2	"'(Part 2)
3	"' III. Lanikai Bay, during daylight.
4	"'If there is a star on the head of the
5	sail of the Star Boat it indictors signals 1, 2, 3, or
6	4.
7	"'If there is a Vstar and a Roman numeral
8	III it indicates signal 5, 6, 7, or 8.
9	"'IV. Lights in the attic window of
10	Kalama House will indicate the following:
11	"! Times Signal
12	
13	2100-2200 5
14	2200-2300 6 2300-2400 7
15	
16	"'V. K.G.M.B. Want Ads.
17	"'A. Chinese rug, etc. for sale, apply
18	P 0. box 1476 indicates signal 3 or 6.
19	"'B. CHIC. CO farm etc. apply P.O. box
20	1476 indicates signal 4 or 7.
21	"'C. Beauty operator wanted etc. apply
22	P. O. box 1476 indicates 5 or 8.
23	"'3. If the above listed signals and wireless
24	messages cannot be made from Oahu, then on Maui Island,
25	6 miles to the northward of Kula Sanatorium at a point
	halfway between Lower Kula Road and Haleakala Road

.

1	(latitude 20040' N., longitude 156019' W., visible
2	from seaward to the southeast and southwest of Maui
3	Island) the following signal bonfire will be made daily
4	urtil your EXEX signal is received:
5	"' Time Signal
6	from 7-12 from 8-9 from 9-10 3 or 6 4 or 7 5 or 8.'"
7	
8	That is the end of the message.
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: We now offer in evidence, if the Court please, IPS document No. 6255-G, which 2 is another message from Honolulu to Tokyo. 3 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 4 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document No. 5 6255-G will receive exhibit No. 1262. (Whereupon, the document above re-7 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 8 No. 1262 and received in evidence.) 9 THE WITNESS: The message dated 5 December 10 1941 (IPS document No. 6255-G, prosecution exhibit No. 11 1262, Japanese message #252) reads as follows: 12 " From: Honelulu. To: Tokyo. 5 December 1941 13 (translated by Navy 10 December 1941). PA-K2). 252. 14 "1(1) During Friday morning, the 5th, 15 16 the three battleships mentioned in my message #239 17 arrived here. They had been at sea for eight days. 18 "'(2) The Lexington and five heavy cruisers 19 left port on the same day. 20 "'(3) The following ships were in port on the 21 afternoon of the 5th: 22 "'8 battleships, 3 light cruisers, 16 de-23 stroyers. 24 "'Four ships of the Honolulu class and . . 25 were in dock. "

A message of 6 December from Honolula to

End of message.

3

1

4 5

7

6

9

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

Tokyo provides direct information for the 'suprise attack' which the passage mentions, dealing with the important subjects of barrage balloons and torpedo nets.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: We now offer in evidence

IPS document No. 6255-H, another Japanese message.

THE FRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document

No. 6255-H will receive exhibit No. 1263.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 1263 and received in evidence.)

THE WITNESS: This message (IPS document No. 4255-H, prosecution's exhibit No. 1263, Japanese message #253) reads as follows:

"'From: Honolulu

"'To: Tokyo

"'December 6, 1941 (translated by Army 8 December, 1941)

" 'PA-K2

"'#253 Re the last part of your #123.

"1. On the American Continent in October the Army began training barrage balloon troops at Camp Davis, North Carolina. Not only have they ordered four or five hundred balloons, but it is understood that they are considering the use of those balloons in the defense of Hawaii and Panama. In so far as Hawaii is concerned, though investigations have been made in the neighborhood of Pearl Harbor, they have not set up mooring equipment, nor have they selected the troops to man them. Furthermore, there is no indication that any training for the matinenance of balloons is being undertaken. At the present time there are no signs of barrage balloon equipment. In addition, it is difficult to imagine that they have actually any. However, even though they have actually made preparations, because they must control the air over the water and land runways of the airports in the vicinity of Pearl Harbor, Hickam, Ford and Ewa, there are limits to the balloon defense of Pearl Harbor. I imagine that in all prob-

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

20

21

22

23

```
ability there is considerable opportunity left to take
1
   advantage for a surprise attack against these places.
2
              "'2. In my opinion the battleships do not
3
   have torpedo nets. The details are not known. I will
4
   report the results of my investigation. "
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
2.2
23
24
25
```

"'On the eve of the attack, the Japanese 1 Consul-General sent to Tokyo the following message 2 regarding the ships at anchor and lying at docks in 3 4 Pearl Harbor." CAPTAIN ROBINSON: We now offer in evidence 6 IPS document No. 6255-I, another message. THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 8 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 9 No. (255-I will receive exhibit No. 1264. 10 (Whereupon, the document above re-11 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 12 No. 1264 and received in evidence.) 13 THE WITNESS (Reading continued): 14 message reads as follows: 15 "'From: Horolulu 16 " To: Tokyo 17 "'December 6, 1941 (translated by Army 8 18 December 1941) 19 " PA-K2 20 11 #254 21 "'1. On the evening of the 5th, among the 22 battleships which entered port were (blank) and 23 one submarine tender. The following ships were observed 24 at anchor on the (th: 25 "'9 battleships, 3 light cruisers, 3 submarine

.

tenders, 17 destroyers, and in addition there were 1 4 light cruisers, 2 destroyers lying at docks ( the 2 heavy cruisers and airplane carriers have all left.) "12. It appears that no air reconnaissance 4 is being conducted by the fleet air arm. 1 5

DIRECT

End of message.

"The documents on Japanese espionage and reconnaissance which have been presented have been limited to a few of those dealing with consular espionage in Honolulu, because they show that the activities of the Japanese Navy and Foreign Office in planning and conducting this consular espionage as an aid to the Pearl Harbor attack may be classed with their other activities in preparation for aggressive warfare.

"IV

"The plans and preparations for secret attack by Japanese carrier task force upon the United States naval personnel and ships at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, on 7 December 1941, without rotification having beer giver by Japan to the United States that there would be a commencement of hostilities in a war by Japan against the United States."

In my oral presentation I have deleted the following words which appear in my prepared statement:

11 12

3

6

7

8

9

10

13 14

15 16

17

O

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

"by a previous, explicit and reasoned warning".

"The plans and preparations made by the Japanese Navy with respect to construction of aircraft carriers and of raval bases and fortifications in the Mandated Islands has been presented. Consideration has also been given to Japanese naval plans and preparations concerned with consular espionage as a preparation for surprise naval attack. The consummation of the foregoing plans in delivering the attack on Pearl Harbor by the use of the aircraft carriers, of the fortified Island bases and of the espionage reports will now be presented.

"The attack will be considered with respect to (1) its objectives, (2) its plan and (3) its execution.

"The documents used in this analysis of the attack will be principally (1) the Japanese Combined Fleet Top Secret Operation Order No. 1 (IPS Document No. 17)," now Court Exhibit No. 1252, "(2) Allied Translator and Interpreter Section, Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers Research Report No. 131, Date 1 December 1945, entitled Japan's Decision to Fight (IPS Document No. 1628)," now Court Exhibit No. 809; "and (3) Mesearch Report No. 132, from the same source, hereinafter referred to as ATIS, entitled The Pearl

Harbor Operation (IPS Document No. 1627)."

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Which we now offer in evidence, if the Court please. It is entitled Allied Translator and Interpreter Section, Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, Research Report No. 132, dated 1 December 1945, the Pearl Harbor Operation. This document is published by command of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Fowers. It is duly authenticated by the Chief of Staff and by the Assistant Chief of Staff G-2 General Headquarters, Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, we have previously objected to a similar document to this one or the cround that it has been issued from the headquarters of the Supreme Commander who is the reviewing authority in this case, and we make the same objection to this document.

THE PRESIDENT: We give the same decision as on exhibit No. 809. The objection is overruled. The document is admitted on the usual terms.

CIERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 1627 will receive exhibit No. 1265.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1265 and received in evidence.)

THE WITNESS: (Reading continued) "The objectives of the Pearl Harbor attack have been stated by Admiral NAGANO to be:

Pacific Fleet in order to gain time and maintain freedom of action in the South Seas operation (including the Philippine Islands), and (2) the defense of our mandated islands.' (IPS Document No. 1628, p. 66)" now Court Exhibit No. 809.

"The Chief of Staff Combined Fleet, Admiral ITO said:

utterly crushed with one blow at the very beginning of hostilities... If we insure our strategic supremacy at the very outset of the conflict by attacking and seizing all key points at one blow while America is still unprepared, we can swing the scales of later operations in our favor.

That is IPS Document No. 1627, which has just beer introduced as Court Exhibit No. 1265, pages 7 and 8.

"In Combined Fleet Top Secret Operation Order No. 1, pages 2/7,8 (IPS Document No. 17)" now Court Exhibit No. 1252, the general objectives of the entire Japanese operations are stated as follows:

who knew of the entire plan in advance included NACANO and YAMAMOTO, and those who knew part of the plan included Admiral SHIMADA, Navy Minister, and Admiral OKA, Chief of the Bureau of Naval Affairs. (Same citation, P. 67) Proparatory to a final formulation of the plan, war games were held at Tokyo on September 2 to 13, 1941, with approximately forty key Japanese Naval officers participating and with NAGANO as the ranking officer in charge acting as umpire. (Same document, pp. 4,5,6).

who took part in the preparation of the plan, among the problems to be solved were how to attack most effectively the United States Pacific Fleet in the Hawaiian area. They stated:

enchored ships was the most effective method of putting the main strength of the United States Pacific Fleet in the Hawaii area out of action ... Hence, the following two obstacles were considered:

- ""(e) The feet that Pearl Harbor is narrow and shallow.
- "1(b) The Fact that Pearl Harbor was

probably equiped with torpedo nets.

"'(c) In regard to point (a), it was
planned to attach stabilizers
to the torpedoes and launch them
from an extremely low altitude.

"'(d) In regard to point (b), since
success could not be counted on,
a bombing attack was also employed.'

"57, Additional problems were refueling and effecting surprise in the attack. On these points the same officers stated (same citation, p. 68):

'The ability to refuel and a surprise attack were the keys to this operation. If either of them failed, the execution of the operation would have been impossible.' Refueling at sea was dealt with by making it a matter for special training. To insure surprise, the little travelled northern ocean route was to be used, screening destroyers were to be sent shead, and complete radio silence was to be carried out at sea while deceptive radio activity was to be conducted in the Inland Sea and Kyushu areas. (Same document p. 68)."

"The plan provided in detail for the organization of a select Task Force, under the command of Admiral NAGANO and made up of 6 aircraft carriers, supported by 2 battleships, 2 heavy cruisers, 1 light cruiser, 11 destroyers, 3 submarines and 8 tankers. (Same reference, page 83). Additional units included submarines, both regular size and midget submarines manned by specially trained officers. (Same reference, page 78; IPS document No. 1627, pages 17-23, prosecution's exhibit No. 1265). Carrier-borne attack airplanes numbered 360, namely, 135 dive bombing planes, 104 11 horizontal bombing planes, 40 torpedo planes, and 81 strafing planes. Targets assigned were principally aircraft carriers, airbases and grounded airplanes, 14 but in execution battleships received special attention because of the absence of carriers. (That is from IPS document No. 1628, prosecution's exhibit No. 809. page 84.) 18 "The plan provided, also, for lesser forces

to operate ip various areas. (That is IPS document No.

17, pages 2/104-6, prosecution's exhibit No. 1252.)"

The next paragraph of my prepared statement I have deleted in my oral presentation.

"3. The execution of the plan. On 5 November 1941, Admiral NAGANO issued an order to Admiral YAMAMOTO (IPS document No. 1628, page 75, prosecution's exhibit

3

10

12

13

15

16

17

19

20

21 22

No. 80%) under which YAMAMOTO on the same date (IPS document No. 17, page 2/1, prosecution's exhibit No. 125%) issued Combined Fleet Top Secret Operation Order No. 1, putting the plan into effect. On 7 November, YAMAMOTO issued Order No. 2 (same citation, page 2/152) fixing Y-Day for 8 December, in accordance with the provision in the plan for fixing Y-Day, and, later, X-Day (same document, pages 2, 3).

"On the same date, 7 November 1941, YAMAMOTO issued from his flagship, the NAGATO, an order which directed the Task Force to assemble at Hitokappu Bay at Etorofu Island in the Kuriles, and to take on supplies until 22 November. (IPS document No. 1628, page 77, prosecution's exhibit No. 809).

"On 25 November, YAMAMOTO ordered the TaskForce to move out on 26 November and to 'proceed without
being detected' to the evening rendezvous point set for
3 December. (IPS document No. 1628, page 78, prosecution's exhibit No. 809.)

"On 26 November 1941 at 6600 hours the Task Force moved out on its trip of more than 3000 miles to Pearl Harbor. (Same document, page 78).

3

4 5

6

0

10

12

14

16

18

19 20

21

23

25

"On 2 December the Task Force under way received a Combined Fleet order stating X-Day will be 8 December (7 December Pearl Harbor time).

(same document, p. 78)

"On 2 December, Admiral YAMAMOTO from his flagship, the YAMATO, gave the order to proceed with the attack.

"On the night of 6-7 December (Perrl Harbor time) the Task Force made the run-in southward at top speed (26 knots).

Herbor time) the carriers, when 230 miles due north of Oahu, launched the planes of the First Attack Unit, at 0130 hours, and when 200 miles north of Oahu launched the planes of the Second Attack Unit at 0245 hours. (IPS Document No. 1628, p.71) The planes rendezvoused to the south of the carriers and then flew in to the attack. Torpedo planes and dive bombers attacked from 7:55 to 8:25 1.M.

Horizontal bombers were the principal attackers in an attack lasting from 8:40 to 9:15 1.M. Dive bombers attacked from 9:15 to 9:45, when the raid ended.

"The Task Force, after launching its
planes withdrew at high speed to the northwest, where
the planes, except for approximately 28, returned to the

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

carriers, between 10:30 A. M. and 1:30 P. M. The Task Force then proceeded to Kure. arriving on 23 December.

"The attackers killed 1,999 officers and enlisted men of the U. S. Navy. Rear Admiral Isaac Campbell Kidd, U. S. N., commander of battleship division #1, was killed, presumably in the explosions. aboard his flagship, the USS ARIZONA, where he was last seen in action. All told, the ARIZONA lost 47 officers and 1056 enlisted men. (That is from Navy Department, Chief Naval Personnel, Certificate dated 15 July 1946). The U. S. Marine Corps suffered casualties of 109 killed. (That statement is from Marine Corps Director Personnel Certificate dated 7 May 1946). The U. S. Army lost 234 killed. (That is War Department Casualty Branch Certificate dated 8 July 1946). Civilians killed in the attack numbered 54. Records Bureau, University of Hawaii, Rept. Special Agt. CIC AFLIIDPAC, dated 7 June, 1946.

"The United States lost outright 188 planes;
Japan, 29. The United Statesuffered severe damage to, or
loss of, 8 battleships, 3 light cruisers, 3 destroyers,
and 4 miscellaneous vessels; Japan lost 5 midget submarines.

"The disproportionate extent of losses marks

the extent to which NAGANO and YAMAMOTO and their associates in the Japanese Navy and Government had succeeded in maintaining secrecy and in attaining surprise in their naval plans and preparations between 1931 and 1941, reaching on 7 December 1941 the climax

of their successful planning and preparing.

"By their repeated emphatic warnings in orders and elsewhere that only by complete secrecy and complete surprise could the Pearl Harbor attack succeed, NAGANO and YAMAMOTO and their associates had succeeded in achieving complete secrecy and complete surprise in the Pearl Harbor attack.

"I have been unable to find in the records of the United States Government any information regarding any Japanese document or communication by which the Japanese Government gave to the United States warning that Japan was about to commence hostilities against the United States" I have deleted from my written prepared statement "previous, explicit and reasoned."

"A notice from the Japanese Foreign Office announcing that 'there has arisen a state of war' between Japan and the United States was received in the Office of the Decretary of State at 2:35 A. M. on 10 December 1941, sixty-six hours and forty minutes after the first terpedoes and bombs from the Japanese carrier planes

25

struck Pearl Harbor." 1 THE PRESIDENT: If the Admiral forgot to mention the exhibit number as well as the prosecution 3 document number in any case, the shorthand reporters are authorized to insert the exhibit number. I think he gave the exhibit number in most, if not all, cases. 6 CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Yes, sir. 7 THE PRESIDENT: We will recess now for fifteen 8 minutes. 9 (Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was 10 · taken until 1500, after which the proceedings 11 were resumed as follows:) 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International M 1 Military Tribunal for the Far Hast is now resumed. r 2 THE PRESIDENT: Captain Robinson. CAPTAIN ROBINSON: If it please the Tribunal, & Admiral Richardson's statement was tendered for identi-B fication and given exhibit No. 1249 for identification. I now formally tender the statement in evidence, 7 modified to agree with the oral presentation by the 8 witness. 9 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 10 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 11 No. 6257 has been marked exhibit No. 1249 and will 12 retain that number. 13 (Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit 14 No. 1249 was received in evidence.) 15 CAPTAIN ROBINSON: That concludes the direct 16 testimony. 17 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon. 18 19 20 CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BRANNON:

21

22

23

24

25

Q Did I understand correctly that the Supreme Commander requested the Secretary of the Navy to produce a witness to testify as to certain documents in custody of the United States Naval Department?

That is correct. A 1 Q Were you named in that request personally. 2 The request of the Supreme Commander for the 3 Allied Powers was forwarded through the War Department 4 and he requested the War Department to request the 5 Navy Department to designate a senior officer. My name was not mentioned. Then, being a senior officer, you were selected 8 by the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, is that correct? 10 I was designated for the duty by the Secretary A 11 of the Navy, Mr. James Forrestal. 12 What were his instructions to you at that time? 13 I did not see the Secretary of the Navy within 14 two months preceding my first appearance here. I did 15 not see him until a few days before I came for my second 16 visit, and at that time all I told him was that I was 17 18 returning and he gave me no instructions. 19 Q How did you receive the appointment from the 20 Secretary of the Navy, Admiral? 21 THE PRESIDENT: What is the point of this, Mr. Brannon? I would like to be enlightened. 23

24

MR. BRANNON: The defense would like to know exactly what the circumstances were that led to the appointment of this particular witness.

THE PRESIDENT: There could be many reasons, none of which would concern us unless they bore on his competency. If you suggest that he is incompetent, well, we will have to determine it. You had better make your grounds clear straighteway.

MR. BRANNON: I don't think any American questions the competency of Admiral Richardson. My point is that this is apparently the first affidavit which contains a statement that the Supreme Commander requested a witness to appear.

THE PRESIDENT: The request comes from a neutral authority. The Supreme Commander has not indicted these people. He created the Court and gave it its authority but he did not indict any of the accused. He is perfectly neutral. I don't know why you bring his name into it.

MR. BRANNON: It is in the first peregraph of the affidevit, Mr. President. We only went to rest assured that the Court is not attaching any special significance to the fact that the request emanated from any such high source.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: If the Court please, the request --

THE PRESIDENT: It isn't worthwhile wasting any more time on it.

4

3

6

7 8

9

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

24

25

may show clearly what the situation is, if the Court please, we would like to say that the request came from International Prosecution Section to the Supreme Commander as the appropriate channels for such request to be transmitted by.

THE PRESIDENT: From the defense and through
the Supreme Commander, I anticipate that other
requests will be made for defense witnesses. I have
already indicated that the Supreme Commander's influence
or authority may have to be sought for defense witnesses.
BY MR. BRANNON (Continued):

Q Did you draft this report personally?

A A man of my years and experience seldom does the initial spade work. The project is mine; I supervised its preparation and its final re-write is my own work.

Q Did you bring the records to Japan with you which you have mentioned in your report?

A I did not personally bring the documents with me. They were in the custody of subordinates of mine who accompanied me in the same plane in which I came to Japan.

Q But all of the evidence which you have used here did come from the official navel files, is that so?

A It did. I repeat, itdid.

Q Earlier today you stated that, and I quote,
"I wish to stress the fact that I am testifying neither
as an expert witness stating opinions nor as a witness
stating facts within his own knowledge."

A I did.

6

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

Q Then am I to understand that any opinion which you have expressed here is not given with the idea that you are an expert on the subject but it is merely a statement of facts as you have found them in naval records?

A I made an earnest effort to state facts only and avoid stating opinions. In so far as I know, I succeeded and the facts stated are supported by official documents.

Q Page 3, paragraph 3 of your affidavit or report, you make the statement that YAMAMOTO and NAGANO recognized as early as 1934 that the aircraft carrier was the best type of navel arm for expansion and aggression. I do not quote you. Why do you include NAGANO in that remark?

A Because of the statements made in one of the documents presented.

Q I presume you have reference to 6251 -TH PRESIDENT: Fxhibit number please,

Mr. Brannon. 1251 is the exhibit number. Q (Continuing) Exhibit 1251A. As I read that 2 it appears that you have quoted NAGANO as of January 15, 3 1936, not 1934. Am I correct? 4 THE PRESIDENT: Is the date a material consider-5 ation? So far back? MR. BRANNON: I think every error or misstate-7 ment in a report as technical as this is important. THE PRESIDENT: You still have to consider 9 the substance only. 10 You have used the words "expansion and 11 aggression" on page 3, same paragraph. I will ask you 12 if in any document that you have presented referring 13 to any statement by NAGANO there was any statement made 14 concerning the word "expansion" or that interpretation 15 placed thereon. 16 17 In this document the words "non-aggression," 18 "non-menace" and "offensive armament, " "offensive character" are used. I see no use of the word "expan-19 20 sion." 21 Admiral YAMAMOTO is dead, is he not? C

(Whereupon, the last question was read

by the official court reporter as above recorded)

A I didn't get that.

A I believe so.

22 23

24

Q I will ask you if the quotation, which you have attributed to Admiral YAMAMOTO on page 4 of your document, is actually a quotation from the evidence that you have presented. I refer you to page 3 of exhibit 1250A.

A That is quoted from an official document of the State Department. In the beginning of his statement is: "Admiral NACANO (translation)." In so far as I know it is an exact quotation of what he said.

THE PRESIDENT: It isn't all that he said but it is accurate as far as it goes. It ampears on page 3 of exhibit 1251 and it does not seem to me to be inconsistent with anything omitted.

MR. BRANNON: It is a quotation, Mr. President, of a man now dead, and it isn't a quotation. That is, it is a reporters resume. I believe the witness has not followed me on that.

ment in which it appears presenting the views of Admiral YAMAMOTO. That is correct. That is not and should not appear to be an exact quotation of Admiral YAMAMOTO because it is a copy of the record of the conversations which took place and does not presume to be a direct quotation.

A 1 b r 2 a m 3 & 4 E 5 d e 6 r 7

THE PRESIDENT: I understood he was referring to NAGANO.

MR. BRANNON: To NAGANO, did you say, Mr. President?

THE PRESIDENT: YAMAMOTO is referred to also.

Do you want YAMAMOTO's exact words? It may be painfully slow to get them from this witness. There
may be an exhibit, or you may be able to refer to
the exact words.

MR. BRANNON: Mr. President, I am referring to more than just words. It appears that this witness has attempted to relate a sequence of events starting with the Japanese attitude at the 1940 Sub-London Conference.

THE PRESIDENT: Are you suggesting he has wrongfully attributed sentiments to YAMAMOTO and NAGANO? If so, you may question about that from information you possess. I am putting no limit on you in getting the exact words used by YAMAMOTO and NAGANO, Mr. Brannon. I am sure the witness will admit them if he recognizes them, but you haven't put them before him.

MR. BRANNON: I am referring to exhibit 1250-A.

Q I am asking you to compare that with your

9

11 12

10

13

14 15

16

18

19

20

22

23

6

5

7 8

10

11

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

22

21

23

25

statement attributed to YAMAMOTO and to tell me if
the only real quotation of YAMAMOTO set out in that
exhibit is as follows: (Page 3 of that exhibit, and
I quote:) "I consider that the real aim of our
proposal goes beyond the setting of a common upper
limit. I look upon the spirit of our proposal as
being to reduce the menace of war and to make it
more difficult to wage war. In technical discussions
on the other hand we consider the problem of how to
carry on war most advantageously, which is the opposite of the purpose of our discussions."

Is that not the actual quotation appearing in your document, of YAMAMOTO?

A The part just read by you was not presented by me. It does appear in the document which was introduced and appears in quotation marks.

Q Do you recognize that the part of YAMAMOTO's statement that you put in quotes is not actually his quoted statement?

THE PRESIDENT: To set your mind at rest,

I think I can tell you the Tribunal will disregard

quotation marks, but according to exhibit 1250-A,

page 4, it is still what YAMAMOTO said, Mr. Brannon.

MR. BRANNON: It is a statement of the reporter's resume of what he said, Mr. President,

7 8

and since it was not complete, we thought that it did not convey the full meaning of the speaker.

THE PPESIDENT: It is that part enclosed on page 3 of 1250-A. We appreciate your point. You need not deal with it further.

Q I refer you to page 4 of your report and ask
you if NAGANO stated that the aircraft carrier was
the principal type of aggressive naval arm exclusively?

A He stated, as I stated, they advocated the abolition of aircraft carriers and a drastic reduction in capital ships and "A" Class cruisers, and in a memorandum that was the official opinion of the Japanese Delegation they were classified in order of offensive types, one, aircraft carrier; two, capital ships; three, "A" Class cruisers.

Q Then I will ask you if NAGANO did not also advocate abolition of the capital ships other than the aircraft carriers?

A I cannot state it in clearer terms than he stated it himself in the part I quoted.

Q Admiral, I only want to ascertain that you realize that the Navy at that time thought that the battleships and other capital ships were offensive naval arms as well as the aircraft carriers.

On page 4 of your affidavit you refer to the official naval leadership and personal cooperation of NAGANO and YAMAMOTO.

A That is correct.

O I will ask you if you attribute any special significance to the fact that FAGANO and YAMAMOTO at two different periods represented their country as delegates to the naval conferences?

A None except that they were probably considered the best able to present the views of those who selected them.

YANAMOTO served together for a considerable period of time as Minister and Vice Minister of Navy, 1936 and '37. May I ask you what you mean by the words "considerable period?"

A If it will better serve the purpose of the Tribunal I can quote from a Japanese report the exact years in which they served together.

O "ill you please do that?

A Admiral NACANO, according to this report,

14

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

was Minister of the Navy from March 9, 1936 to
February 2, 1937, and Vice Admiral YAMAMOTO was
Vice Minister of the Navy from 1 December '36 to
30 August '39.

© Is that a considerable period of time, 1

 Is that a considerable period of time, in your estimation?

A It is that.

THE PRESIDENT: Perhaps he intends to cover 1941 and 1943. I don't know. It does not read that way.

MR. BRANNON; It appears from the figures that he gave that is about a period of sixty days.

THE PRESIDENT: That is all.

MR. BRANNON: Am I correct in that?

THE PRESIDENT: You can pass over that.

THE WITNESS: That is true.

THE PRESIDENT: It is a very short period,

O Then you do not attach any special significance to the fact that they served sixty days together, as Minister and Vice Minister of the Navy, do you, sir?

A No, but I -- I attach no importance to it whatever, but no officer can rise to be a Minister of the Navy and another at the same time

4

2

3

7

8

0

,

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

19

20 21

22

23

1 2 3

3

5

7

8

10

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

20

22

21

23 24

25

be Vice Minister, without them having been associated together for a long time.

O Do you not consider that statement slightly misleading, Admiral?

A It possibly is to those that are uninformed, but not to anyone who knows the Navy.

I believe you misunderstand me. I speak of your reference to the phrase "considerable period."

Is it, in raval parlance or circles, unusual that two senior officers, such as NAGANO and YAMAMOTO, might end up as Chief of Naval Ceneral Staff and Commander in Chief of the combined fleets?

THE PRESIDENT: It could happen anywhere, but it did happen in Japan. I don't think there is much in the point, Mr. Brannon.

MR. BRANNON: I seek to show that the paragraph here inserted by the witness is of no consequence or meaning when boiled down to the actual factual circumstances.

On page 6 of your report you use the words "abolition of existing treaty limitations." Is it not a fact that Japan did not abolish the treaty limitations of 1930, but that they expired?

A In so far as they were binding on Japan they ceased to have any meaning in accordance with

1	
1	the terms of the treaty, because of Japan's
2	denounciation of the treaty. Their effectiveness
3	was abolished.
4	o Did Japan propose a different proposition
5	in regard to naval limitation in 1934, rather than
6	abolish the existing treaty limitations?
7	A As stated by me, she proposed a treaty
8	limitation based on what she called a common upper
9	limit.
10	O Then there was nothing illegal about the
11	action of Japan in proposing a new treaty limita-
12	tion in place of the old?
13	THE PRESIDENT: We decide questions of la
14	There wasn't, Mr. Brannon.
15	"e will adjourn until half past nine to-
16	
17	morrow morning.
18	(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjourn-
19	ment was taken until Tuesday, 26 November
20	1946, at 0930.)